

up here saying we have to right that wrong.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PRYOR. Would you permit me to offer an amendment relative to righting that wrong, to protect the consumers from these unfair drug prices?

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, first of all, it is not a wrong. The Senate Judiciary Committee just passed a bill out to resolve that—

Mr. PRYOR. I want to talk about it.

Mr. HATCH. To resolve that matter, 10-7. That is the appropriate way to debate this. If the Senator disagrees with that bill, the Senator can do so.

I think it is telling here that we have a bill which passed the House 350 to 43 that the President said he would sign to right this wrong, that my friends on the other side of the aisle are attempting to derail.

Mr. PRYOR. We are not trying to derail anything.

Mr. HATCH. Sure you are, if you vote against cloture. Keep in mind, if we have cloture, any relevant amendment—this is amendable by any relevant amendment—if we get cloture, you can bring up any relevant amendment you want. Of course, the GATT amendment is not relevant. Any germane amendment, I should say.

I am really concerned that my colleagues on the other side are more concerned about partisanship than righting wrongs. Everybody knows that the GATT amendment which the distinguished Senator has tried to pass now for months and which is heartfelt on both sides, is certainly not germane to this bill. It is not relevant to this bill. It certainly would cloud this bill, as would any other amendment.

We want to pass a bill that rights this terrific wrong to Billy Dale and to his colleagues.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I hope my colleague will allow me to say something. No one knows more than the distinguished Senator from Utah that, under some conditions, relevancy does not matter as to an amendment in the Senate. It does in the House but not in Senate. So set that record straight.

Second, the Senator has mentioned that the Judiciary Committee on Thursday, 10 to 7, passed out the solution to the Glaxo amendment.

Mr. President, what this did, this particular measure, I say in all respect to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Judiciary Committee's proposal to correct the Glaxo issue made matters worse for the generic drug companies by adding 20 more months of patent protection for Glaxo and for a handful of drug companies that are reaping a \$5-million-a-day windfall from our error. That is what the bill did. This bill that came from the Judiciary Committee on Thursday added additional obstacles. It added months and perhaps years of court litigation.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 has arrived.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 30 seconds for each of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. What in the world does the Glaxo thing or the Zantac thing have to do with Billy Dale and getting compensation to Billy Dale? Tell me, what in the world does it have to do with this bill that everybody agrees ought to be passed, including the President?

Mr. PRYOR. Because it is based upon the same principle the Senator from Utah enunciated when he got up to speak. This is to right a wrong. The GATT issue is to right a wrong. I subscribe to that same issue.

Mr. HATCH. Well, there are two sides to that issue. Thus far, the Judiciary Committee has taken a side that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas does not agree with. The fact is, there is a time to debate that bill. Let us bring the bill up and have a full-fledged debate, and I think everybody will realize there is much merit as to what the Judiciary Committee did.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BREAU. I ask unanimous consent that the time before the recesses be extended for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REAL WELFARE REFORM

Mr. BREAU. Mr. President, while the discussion has been interesting, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on Sunday with reference to the President's statement on welfare reform, which I think is very significant. While the Congress tries to come together on a welfare reform plan, it is very clear that the administration is trying to move forward on its own to get things done which are real reform. He said—and I totally agree—"We have to make it clear that a baby doesn't give you a right, and won't give you the money, to leave home and drop out of school." The President said that in his weekly radio address.

The Executive order that followed up on that statement, I think, is real welfare reform. What it does is simply require, through Executive order, without waiting on the Congress, that States require that teen mothers, who are having children, stay at home or live at home in adult supervision, or go to school, and that if they do neither, their welfare benefits would no longer be allowed to continue.

With this executive action, all 50 States will now be required to keep teen mothers, who are on welfare and who have children, in school; and that for the first time, the administration will now be able to—and intends to—audit all of those States to make sure that, in fact, they are doing that.

In addition, all 50 States will now be able to provide what are, in essence, rewards to encourage those who do stay in school, but also sanctions for those who do not. Teen mothers in all 50 States, who have dropped out of school, will now have to sign personal responsibility plans requiring them to get a job or go to school.

The whole idea behind this is self-sufficiency. It is clear that the whole system has not worked. In addition, all 50 States will be encouraged to require minor mothers to live at home, or with a responsible adult, in order to receive assistance.

Mr. President, it is clear, and we all know that about half of all welfare recipients in our country have their first child as a teenager. If we are really talking about true welfare reform, we have to encourage good behavior, staying in school, or living with an adult family, a mother and father, or a mother, or adult supervisor, to help provide the training for that person.

This action by the President is part of an ongoing effort to try and reform welfare. The administration has given welfare waivers to allow States to be creative to 37 of our 50 States, allowing them to impose tough time limits and tough, new work requirements. The whole idea is to be tough on work but good for children. It is high time that the Congress enact real welfare reform so that we do not have to continue to do it from an administrative standpoint.

But this was a very significant decision. I applaud the administration and President for taking it. Last, I think we are making some real progress in putting the welfare system back on the right track so that people will no longer have to be dependent on it.

It is clear, the President said once again, that having a child does not give you a right; it really gives you additional responsibility. This step on the part of the President will ensure that that responsibility on the part of teen mothers, working with adult supervision and going to school, is going to bring about real welfare reform.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:14 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SANTORUM).

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule

XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 2937, an act for the reimbursement of attorney fees and costs incurred by former employees of the White House Travel Office with respect to the termination of their employment in that office on May 19, 1993:

Bob Dole, Orrin Hatch, Spencer Abraham, Chuck Grassley, Larry Pressler, Ted Stevens, Rod Grams, Strom Thurmond, Thad Cochran, Judd Gregg, Paul D. Coverdell, Connie Mack, Conrad Burns, Larry E. Craig, Richard G. Lugar, Frank H. Murkowski.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 2937 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on this vote, I have a live pair with the Senator from Vermont. If he were here, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Pressler
Brown	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	
Frist	McCain	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Breaux	Heflin	Pryor
Bryan	Hollings	Reid
Bumpers	Inouye	Robb
Byrd	Johnston	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerrey	Simon
Dodd	Kerry	Wellstone
Dorgan	Kohl	Wyden
Exon	Levin	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR

Pell, for

NOT VOTING—3

Chafee

Lautenberg

Leahy

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I and many others are very disappointed we cannot move forward on this legislation. I believe this legislation is very important to provide relief for Mr. Dale and six other members of the White House Travel Office. I think it is the right thing to do. To me, the bill is a decent gesture that Congress can make to seven individuals who have been forced to endure a tremendous injustice. These people were publicly, knowingly, and wrongly accused of severe improprieties. They had their careers put in jeopardy, their finances devastated and their reputations forever stained for what appears to be an effort for personal gain of insiders.

Three years ago when Billy Dale and the other members of the Travel Office were fired, the statement released by the White House on the firings was a source of immediate concern. It said:

Within the Travel Office, we found sort of gross mismanagement, if you will. There is basically very shoddy accounting practices, mismanagement and a number of other things. In order to correct those, we thought it advisable to take immediate action.

My concern over those firings was certainly not eased when it was disclosed that the Travel Office staff was fired based on an audit that was neither complete nor available to anyone for review. The Travel Office staff was fired and accused of mismanagement without being given the opportunity for a hearing or a chance to clear their names. Finally, travel business that was handled by salaried employees of the Federal Government previously and done on a noncommissioned basis was turned over to a Little Rock travel group.

At that time, I was ranking member on the Treasury, Postal Appropriations Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the funding for the White House. I sent a personal letter to the President requesting answers to the questions and the reasoning for selecting the Little Rock travel agency.

Unfortunately, like so many things from the administration, we did not get straight answers. There were half-truths and misleading statements. What the White House should have

done is have the courage to tell the public the individuals were fired so that business could be given to friends of the First Family.

But instead, the White House made the decision to question publicly the integrity of seven career civil servants. Unfortunately for Mr. Dale and his colleagues, they also launched an investigation and a prosecution and hid behind the accusations.

As one commentator stated:

The administration tried to transform a prosaic personnel change into an act of moral heroism.

The President immediately absolved himself saying:

I had nothing to do with any decision except to save the taxpayers and the press money. The only thing I know is we made a decision to save taxpayers and the press money. That's all I know.

The First Lady also denied any involvement. Then an embarrassing memo was released from David Watkins in the White House laying the responsibility for the firing squarely at the feet of the First Lady. Despite this memo, denials continued from the White House. She maintains that she just "expressed concern" regarding mismanagement.

The White House remained unflinching in their refusal to admit that the firings had anything to do with anything other than financial mismanagement on behalf of the Travel Office staff. It was undoubtedly to continue that perception that the White House pushed the Department of Justice on to Mr. Dale. They had a very weak case, and they went forward nevertheless at a tremendous personal and financial cost to Mr. Dale.

Despite the White House spin and the efforts to lay the blame at the feet of Mr. Dale and his colleagues, the facts have come out. These are not pretty.

No. 1, a cousin of the President who had worked on travel during the campaign wanted to head the White House Travel Office.

No. 2, a Hollywood friend of the President had an interest in an airline charter company that wanted to profit from the White House business, and he was not happy the Travel Office was not giving him any opportunities.

No. 3, the relative of the President and the Hollywood friend concocted stories of corruption and people on the take. The President's cousin even took documents and files out of the Office to try to make a case against the Travel Office staff.

No. 4, according to the memo from David Watkins, the First Lady said we would have hell to pay if we cannot comply with the First Lady's wishes to fire the staff.

Finally, the White House made a public statement accusing the staff of gross misconduct. The White House, despite longstanding policy to the contrary, without checking with the Department of Justice, contacted and politicized the FBI to try to back up their efforts.

Unfortunately, after much personal harassment and great disruption and embarrassment to all of the members of the White House travel staff, the punishment did not end there. Mr. Dale was indicted for allegedly embezzling funds. But, as all of us now know the jury found him not guilty in less than 2 hours. As the distinguished chairman of our Judiciary Committee has noted yesterday, that is usually the amount of time it takes most juries to get organized. Talk about an open-and-shut case. That one was clearly it.

Mr. Dale said after his acquittal he was relieved and prepared to go on with his life. Unfortunately, that is not what happened. Within weeks the Watkins memo surfaced—and it squarely contradicted the sworn testimony of the First Lady before GAO investigators—and the Clinton damage control team went into a full-court press. The White House spin doctors, Anne Lewis, the Clinton campaign, and high-priced Washington lawyers, including Mr. Bennett, and even the First Lady herself in interviews, continued to make allegations that had been thrown out in the criminal proceedings against Mr. Dale and the White House staff.

I think enough is enough. The dedicated public servants who worked in the Travel Office have suffered enough. I think that this bill is a small gesture which would not only offer some consolation to these people, but help them get out of the financial hole this whole matter has caused them. It was with great disappointment that we learned that the other side has chosen to filibuster this. My only guess is that this is an effort to save the President the embarrassment of having to sign this bill.

I urged last week that the majority leader bring this bill to the floor so we could hear arguments against it on the Senate floor. I am still waiting to hear any compelling argument. I appreciate the majority leader having called it up. I hope that one of these days very shortly we can get on with doing a very simple act of justice by providing compensation for some of the expenses and costs incurred. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I believe, considering the results of the last vote, where it is very clear that there is a filibuster by the opposition to hold this bill up, it is important that the public have a chance to weigh in because this is such a political issue here trying to avoid this bill coming to the White House to save the President the embarrassment of signing it. When there are this much politics in the issue, and the public at the grassroots weigh in, they can make a considerable impact on the legislative process here in the Congress of the United States.

This may be one of those times when the public can make a difference, because this is clearly such a political move by the other side of the aisle. If

politics wins out over right, then in the end wrong wins. It seems to me that the public will not want that to happen and they cannot allow that to stand.

This is such a clear-cut issue. First of all, there are seven employees involved that were fired. We have already taken legislative action for the others, but for Mr. Dale, no, because at the time we took action for the others, his trial was pending. Mr. Dale was subsequently then found not guilty by the jury.

So now we are taking action to do for Mr. Dale the same as we did for everybody else. There was no debate in this body whatsoever over the action that we took on the others. It went through noncontroversial. The situation with Mr. Dale should be handled the same way. It should have gone through here in what we call wrapup at the end of the day and do it where we do all the noncontroversial measures.

But what we have seen today is politics at its best—politics at its best in the sense that the stonewalling is at its best, to see something that is right not to go on, not to go through, because there might be some embarrassment for the President. The Democrats want to protect the President from that embarrassment. Today what we have seen is kind of a drive-by sabotage of this effort to right the wrong that has been conducted against Mr. Dale, because he was unfairly, wrongfully fired.

Maybe there is no question he could have been fired, but the point is how the White House has tried to explain it and supposedly explain it away as a legitimate way of doing business. All the harm that has come to the family, not only of the employee who was fired, but the family because they have been wrongly treated, wrongly treated by a person who ought to know because he preaches the communitarian spirit that we ought to have one toward the other. That is what the President of the United States preaches.

We ought to have charity. This does not show the charity that the President preaches that we all ought to have one toward the other when somebody is wrongfully fired, when you bring the FBI and the Justice Department to bring a guy to trial. Then he has gotten off, and then we are trying to right that wrong by covering the legal expenses of Mr. Dale. It is wrong for the other side, acting at the behest of the White House, to avoid embarrassment for the White House for this all to go on and then at the other time preach a spirit of charity and communitarianism towards one another in this country.

The whole effort is being sabotaged. Worse yet, it is being sabotaged without even the other side engaging in much debate on the issue. They have really succeeded in legislative harassment of Mr. Dale, the same sort of harassment, just in another environment, that has been done against Mr. Dale by the White House, by the Justice De-

partment, by the IRS. Thus continues, as I see it, the White House campaign to avoid embarrassment on this issue.

It is very clearly a clear-cut, right-versus-wrong issue. Politics has won out this day. The President continues to avoid responsibility for his actions. The victims continue to be wronged. That is why when it is so clear-cut, when our judicial system has cleared somebody, then I think it is a time for the American people to weigh in.

I ask the American people to make their voices heard on this issue, to hold the President's feet to the fire. Even if you are a Democrat out there in Main Street America, it seems to me that you want your President to do what is right. What is right is to sign this legislation, to call off the hordes on Capitol Hill that are preventing this measure from coming to a vote, and have the President demonstrate his charitable attitude that he preaches. Tell the President of the United States to show moral leadership, to do the right thing, to sign this bill.

Lastly, if politics wins in this instance, then it wins over right. When that happens, politics wins over right, then wrong wins. The public cannot allow this to stand.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL THE GASOLINE TAX

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, there is a growing concern in our country about the rise of fuel prices, the rise of gasoline prices. Obviously, the President shares this concern. We have committee hearings underway. We have studies. We have investigations.

We all know that there is only one thing we can do that is going to bring down gasoline prices immediately. In fact, we have the capacity, by acting now, to bring down the cost of filling up the gas tank on your car, on your van, on your truck. We can save you about \$1 a fill-up by repealing the 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline that was adopted in 1993.

That gasoline tax increase did not go to build new highways; it went to general revenue. What we would like to do today is repeal that gasoline tax. We would like to repeal that tax on highway gasoline, on highway diesel fuel, on railroad diesel fuel, on inland waterway diesel fuel, on aviation gasoline, on noncommercial jet fuel, and on commercial jet fuel. We would like to repeal that 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax on each of those fuels, do it today and have that repeal in effect until the end of the year, giving us an opportunity to write a budget and to institute a permanent repeal as part of that new budget.